REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

1. A Substitute Specification is provided herewith with section headings in accordance with U.S. practice and some modification of the language. The Substitute Specification does not contain any new matter. It is accompanied by a marked-up version showing the changes made.

2. Claims 1-24 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 25-35 carefully drafted to define the invention with particularity over the references.

The new claims are not narrative or indefinite and positively recite the invention.

3. The claims in this case originally were not rejected on art. The BILLARD reference mentioned by the Examiner is clearly pertinent but fails to show the combination of the central spherical configuration and the aspherical portion surrounding it.

BILLARD, therefore, does not suggest the claimed lens nor is there any other reference in the case which can suggest it.

Accordingly, claims 25-35 should be considered to be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.

By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicant

ef-
September 19, 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosures: Substitute Specification
Marked-up original specification